

CONFESSION OF FAITH.

CHAPTER 29.-*Of the Lords Supper.*

V. The outward Elements, in this Sacrament, duly set apart, to the uses ordained by Christ, have such relation to him crucified, as that, truly, yet Sacramentally only, they are sometimes called by the name of the things they represent, to wit, the Body and Blood of Christ¹; albeit, in substance and nature, they still remain, truly, and only Bread and Wine, as they were before².

Question 1.—*Do the outward elements, in this sacrament, duly set apart, to the uses ordained by Christ, have such relation to him crucified, as that, truly, yet sacramentally only, they are sometimes called by the name of the things they represent, to wit, the body and blood of Christ?*

Answer.—Yes. Matt. 26:26-28. This question lies as a basis under the other controversies of this topic (which depend on the understanding of it, such as the controversies concerning the bodily presence and the oral manducation of Christ in the Supper, transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the Mass, the carrying around and the adoration of this sacrament and other things of the same kind), it stands in need of close examination and ought to be attentively considered. As the meaning of all Scripture is twofold: proper, or literal, and tropical, or figurative. That the representation of these elements is tropical is proved: 1.) From the words used in the institution itself. *This* in the first symbol ought to be explained in the same way as in the second, since there is the same reason for both. Luke and Paul expound the *this* of Matthew and Mark, which is used by them 'This is my blood', by the 'cup', *cf.* Luke 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25; Matt. 26:28; Mark 14:24. Likewise, Paul interprets the *this* of the bread, 1 Cor. 10:16. 2.) From the design of Christ and the circumstances of the institution. The design of Christ was twofold: a.) to institute a sacrament of the New Testament; b.) to substitute a new rite for the old—the Lord's supper for the Passover. Thus, first, the mind and scope of the speaker determines the way the words are to be taken; but the design of Christ in the institution was to ordain a New Testament sacrament, therefore the words also must be understood sacramentally and tropically, Luke 22:19, 20. Second, the same tropical mode of speech used in the Passover ought to be retained here also, *cf.* Ex. 12:11, 21. The circumstances prove the same thing, whether antecedent or consequent. a.) The body of Christ reclined at the table in the first Supper, so therefore it could not have been handed to the disciples, but rather the bread on the table was handed, Luke 22:14, 19. b.) Christ separated the bread and the wine in the Supper, but no separation was then made of his body and blood, Matt. 26:26-28. c.) Christ himself eats of that bread and drinks of the cup, Matt. 26:29. But who will say he ate and drank his own body and blood? d.) The Supper is a memorial of an absent Christ, 1 Cor. 11:26. How can these be symbols and memorials of his body and blood if he be present in them? 3.) From the nature and analogy of the sacraments. The nature of the sacraments, whether ordinary or extraordinary, demands a tropical sense and the analogy of all sacraments constantly retains it. Thus, circumcision is called the covenant of God, Gen. 17:10; *i.e.*, the sign of

¹ Matt. 26:26-28.

² 1 Cor. 11:26-28; Matt. 26:29.

the covenant, God himself interpreting it, Gen. 17:11, and Paul, Rom. 4:11. The paschal lamb is called the Lord's passover, Ex. 12:11, *i.e.*, a memorial of the passing over of the angel and of the people, according to God's own declaration, Ex. 13:9. Also, the rock is said to be Christ because representing him, 1 Cor. 10:4; the legal sacrifices and purifications are called ablutions and expiations of sin, Lev. 4:31; 14:7, 8, *i.e.*, types, shadows and signs of that true expiation, the Holy Spirit thus interpreting, Heb. 8:5; 10:1. The Sabbath is said to be a covenant of the Lord, Ex. 31:13, 17; baptism is called the laver of regeneration, Tit. 3:5, because it is the antitype of the blessings of Christ, 1 Pet. 3:21. 4.) From the parallel passages. a.) Paul explains the words of Christ figuratively and sacramentally by substituting *communion* for the body and the blood, 1 Cor. 10:16. b.) Paul joins baptism and the Supper as equals, 1 Cor. 12:13. Yet in baptism, the washing of the water is not the washing from sins by the blood of Christ properly and literally, but tropically and sacramentally. Therefore, the same should be the reason of this drinking. c.) John opens up the mystery of the eating of Christ, not in a proper and literal sense, which Christ himself rejects and condemns, John 6:62, 63; but in a spiritual and tropical sense when he shows his flesh and blood are received for eternal life in no other way than by faith, John 6:35, 47, 54. 5.) From the analogy of the articles of faith. a.) Any other notion is opposed to the article concerning the truth of Christ's human nature because any body that could be present in the various ways suggested cannot be the body which Christ assumed from the Virgin Mary through the Holy Spirit. b.) It is opposed to the article concerning the one and only death and crucifixion of Christ because if the bread broken and the wine poured out is properly and literally the body and blood of Christ, then he must necessarily die every time the Supper is celebrated. c.) It is opposed to his ascension because he left earth and was translated into heaven. d.) If Christ lies concealed under the bread, he ought to be expected no more to return in judgment. e.) It is opposed to the communion of the saints, which should be extended to believers of both Testaments; but this cannot be if the communion of Christ's body is carnal and proper.

Question 2.—*Do the outward elements still remain, in substance and nature, truly, and only bread and wine, as they were before?*

Answer.—Yes. 1 Cor. 11:26-28; Luke 22:18. Thus do the Papists err who maintain that the bread and wine, by the words of consecration change into the very body and blood of Christ—called transubstantiation, nothing remaining but the outward forms and accidents of the bread and the wine. They are confuted for the following reasons: 1.) Because the doctrine of transubstantiation makes Christ's body every where present, invisible, that cannot be handled, without shape and figure, without human quantity, which is contrary to Matt. 26:6—here Christ is only present in Bethany. And John 20:27, Thomas touches Christ, and according to Acts 3:21, the heavens must receive him; and therefore cannot be everywhere, *cf.* Heb. 3:14, 17. 2.) Because before and after consecration, the bread is called the communion of the body of Christ; but nothing is said, or can be the communion of its own self, 1 Cor. 10:16. 3.) Because after consecrations, the apostle calls not the bread, a species, or form of bread, 1 Cor. 11:26-28. And after the consecration, Christ calls the wine the fruit of the vine, Matt. 26:29. 4.) Because Christ did institute the supper to be a memorial of himself until he come again. But a memorial is not of things corporally present, but of things absent, 1 Cor. 11:25. 5.) Because that which is properly broken, is not the body of Christ, but the bread is properly broken, therefore, the bread is not the body of Christ, 1 Cor. 10:16. 6.) Because Christ went up to heaven bodily, and is to tarry there until the end of the world, Acts 3:21.